

The Principia.

NEW YORK UNIVERSITY SEPTEMBER 1997

DEFEAT OF THE SOUTH

4. Fertilization — abortion.

The *N. Y. Times* of Oct. 27 under the head of "Southern Deliberation" contains the following remarks on the course of the Southern States sought to take, to prepare for the coming of the North, when they are so forward to threaten. The *Times* very sensibly commences by remarking that the first aim of the South is to create an *ampl. patræ*, have of course, that the slaves themselves, so that they may be enabled to defend themselves against the South. But what next?

[illegible]

And so the *Times* proceeds to propose certain ameliorations, which it thinks quite feasible and calculated to conciliate and to assist the slaves. Among these are, (1) To break up the separation of families, (2) To make matrimony among slaves lawful, (3) To educate the people, and repeal all laws forbidding education. The *Times* then proceeds

"Such laws contemplate the murder of the immortal par-
 and the reduction of God's rational creatures, created
 His own image, to brute beasts.

"We maintain that these odious adjuncts of slavery are
 not essential parts of the system of compulsory labor, the
 maintenance of which, for a time, may be necessary to the
 safety of the white race, and the permanent welfare of the
 black. The removal of the abuses of the system would con-
 ciliate the world at large, and, what is of more importance
 to the South, it would soften the hard lot of the slave, win
 his affection, and attach him to his home and his country."

We should like to know whether the *Times* intended to be ironical, or whether it proposed to the slaveholders in sober earnest, and under the idea of the practicality of the measure during the continuance of slavery.

We should like to know whether it be so, that, after a labor of thirty years on the part of the abolitionists, and we may add, of the slaveholders besides to make the people of this country understand what is *American slavery*—we should really like to know whether there is an American Editor, here too, in this central focus of intelligence, who is so ignorant as not to know that the three million slaves of men and women, who as soon as consummated, demonstrate the practical ability of "immediate emancipation," by producing that fact?

Slaves permitted to marry, and protected in their family rights? Slaves provided with the means of education, and yet regarded as slaves? What would become of "compulsory" slavery, if the slave were not held as property? Or how could they be held as property, yet permitted to marry, if denied in their family rights, and secured a rational separation of families?

What could become of the brave promising States without a fair compromise? And what of the slave-owning States, will of the Northern supply, who are so sufficient to secure their opportunity from Africa? What would be of the slave-laborer by the abolition of separating families? What and hear they be prepared to purchase or purchasing the increased slave value?

[illegible]

We must do nothing—perhaps not for years more—on the question of the Senate, in 1911. While Mr. Taft presides we should have to adopt the proposed amendment that a vote has been given them to let me understand. Then, too, they will not do so if it takes them the question.

we have said, arranged for supplying them from
the office — for Terms, and other semi-annual
books.

LETTER FROM SAMUEL McFARLAND—POSITION OF
GERRIT SMITH, &c.

WASH. STATE, PUBL. 001, 30, 1960

REV. WM. GIBBS.—DEAR SIR: I was highly gratified to see by Gerrit Smith's letter to you in the last *Post*, that he does not intend his "rejection of reason," as was supposed to be a repudiation of the Bible, but a warfare against that false, hypocritical religion of the many, which perverts and distorts the Bible to form it a certain "man-of-straw."

It is to be hoped that from this explanation we shall be better understand our noble departed friend, in fact, that we shall thus be able, harmoniously and successfully to carry forward the great reforms which we are engaged in.

Very truly yours, SAM M. FARRIS

REMARKS

We have already expressed our gratification with the tone and spirit of the last letter of George Smith.

We heartily agree with S. McNair, that harmony among all abolitionists is exceedingly desirable, and that we think his letter implies such harmony is only to be attained through a correct understanding of each other's views, and an agreement in the things necessary to an intelligent co-operation in our measures. But we have not yet seen, by Gerrit Smith's letters, that, *except as a single person*, he claims that we had mistaken his position, that he has explained his position to be different from what we understood it to be, or that, in any particular, he has changed or would desire to have it understood that he has changed his position.

The reasons we gave (in our Review of his letter to the Syracuse Convention) for declining to vote for Gerrit Smith were the following:

1. His long continued and still repeated utterances of discouragement in respect to the ultimate success of our enterprise, so totally unbefitting the leader of that enterprise. In connexion with this, his dissuaves against making any large outlay of expenditures or efforts for its prosecution.

2. His personal declaration of a willingness to annex Cuba to this nation, while both Cuba and this nation continued to maintain slavery.

3. His continued advocacy of a scheme for compensating slave-holders for the emancipation of the slaves.

4. His recent declaration of a readiness to allow the slave States to secede from the Union, without liberating the slaves, rather than have bloodshed in the execution of righteous laws for "delivering the spoiled out of the hands of the oppressor," laws to be enacted under the authority and by the requirements of the Constitution of the United States, as construed by himself and the Liberty Party, of which he was the Presidential Candidate.

5 His proposal to employ the presses and lecturers sustained by the Liberty Party, *i.e.* so much directly to obtain votes, as to reach the people the true religion, the simple religion of reason, and Jesus Christ, meaning, as we understand it, the same "religion of reason," &c., which he has commended in his "Discourses on the Religion of Reason," as distinguished from and opposed to, what he denoted "the absolute book religion, the religion of the text," &c., applying a number of his principles and appropriate rules, in detail, declaring them to be "well-weighed and balanced," such they were, upon the basis of the Religion of Reason, there should be extensive and profitable Reference to Freedom, Temperance, Peace, &c.

Such were our five jozons, to which Harry Snider appended in due tail of the first day's vicissitudes. He was up at six o'clock, and he had followed his partner to the river as early as five.

If it is felt, as I believe, as we all must, it is a pity the allegations that he made to you the previous afternoon of the *Liberty* Press are not the true feelings of the Government, as expressed in the "Circular" to the States, and of your public officers of the Liberty Party. Of the integrity and honesty of this declaration I have no doubt, and we have nothing further than to estimate the facts correctly and accordingly, and not provoked by us. We cannot and cannot be provoked by any good fact. Letting all be

In going on press his question further, Mr. Smith has admitted that our instruction at his point of the Syrian letter was not a good representative example in view of the previous discourse, and he takes the liberty of offering a more guarded against misinstruction by a clearer expression of his meaning.

But the first four objections, vitally important as we find them to the success of our enterprise, remain as we perceive, as they were when we wrote our review of the *Symposium* of Mr. Smith.

As to Mr. Smith's views of the Bible and of sinning, apart from his insisting on their importance in Political Science, and his well-understood bias, his proposals to incorporate them into the Liberty party—as we will mention in time, except in this connection, is one. Because of his Semite bias, he might say, could have said that we should be less than our countrymen, by Mr. McCallum. A word explanation thereof, if any, and retaining on the matter, may not be amiss, before we close.

We have never understood Mr. Smith to believe that the Bill sanctions piracy. We have always understood

to label the contrary. We must suppose him to reject the Bible as *not* good. Consequently the nothing is his letter to remove from our mind any possible impression of *that* fact, which we had before entertained. The more, we reflect on it, is this Mr. Smith's subjects to many of the Indian tribes originally designated evangelical or orthodox. And, although he does concede that all these doctrines are taught in the Bible, he yet holds that they are not *of* the Bible, and that the Bible, as a whole, and as a rule of faith and practice, is not good. He is, therefore, in the Bible, on many points he agrees with the Bible, but he tells us nothing in its authority. He regards it a mere human production, though mainly written by good but imperfect men. His writings, like other writings of good men, he holds to be imperfect. And, so strongly does he oppose the idea, it being regarded authoritative that there can be no permanent or extensive political, moral, or religious reform *until the authority of the book shall be displaced, by the paramount authority of the "religion of reason"*. Our discussion with him does not show that we misunderstand him in this. We are the more convinced that we did not. We could not, indeed, undertake to reconcile, or show the self-consistency of all he says concerning the Bible. Yet I think we may admit that the above is a full and fair account of his position. He is not, as we have supposed, in any way, as yet, in error or defective, we hope and trust he will himself correct our mistake, and supply the defects— which, our readers shall be duly informed.

DR. CLEEVER IS GLASGOW

We are indebted to a friend in Glasgow for copies of the *North British Daily Mail*, for Oct. 18 and 19, the former of which contains a speech of Dr. Cheever, before the Glasgow New Association for the Abolition of Slavery. This was a public meeting, held in the City Hall, the chair being occupied by W P Paton, Esq. Speeches were also made by Rev Henry Bateheler and Rev Henry Canderwood. The speech of Dr Cheever was received with unusual applause.

Dr. HENRY A. — At a large meeting of the Committee on the Glasgow New Association for the Abolition of Slavery, held yesterday in the Reform Institute, Glasgow, Scotland, hearing Dr. Cheever, the following resolutions were proposed by Mr. McDowell, president of the Association, and unanimously adopted:—That the Association renew and strengthen its earnest sympathy with Dr. Cheever and the cause of the Puritans in New York in their noble and heroic testimony of slavery as the highest Christian principle, and as a noble moral mission to the world, and with them in their efforts to bring about the abolition of slavery in the United States.

In the course of his speech in the City Hall, Mr. Thompson reviewed the progress that had been made over the past few months, and the questions one of the Commissioners asked about that is repeated in this regulation in the case.

FROM HON JUDGE ANDERSON.

November 2nd 1891

MR. CANNON.—Sir, I have received from National Bureau I wrote for. They are the best thing I have seen. I am very glad to hear of them. I am very glad to hear of them. I am very glad to hear of them.

